

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

ROMA CAMPBELL,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:05-CV-0843-L
	§	
JO ANNE B. BARNHART, Commissioner	§	
of the Social Security Administration,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	


MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This is a social security case. Plaintiff Roma Campbell (“Plaintiff” or “Campbell”) filed this action seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying her applications for supplemental security income (“SSI”) benefits and disability insurance under Title II and XIV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 401, *et. seq.* Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and an order of the court in implementation thereof, the case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jeff Kaplan for review and submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition. On September 22, 2006, the Findings and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (the “Report”) were filed, to which Defendant timely objected.

After a thorough analysis of the record and applicable law, the magistrate judge concluded that the final decision of the Administrative Law Judge finding Campbell not disabled should be reversed, and the case remanded for further proceedings consistent with his report. *See* Report at 12.

After an independent review of the pleadings, file, record, applicable law, the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions, and consideration of Defendant's Objections,* the court determines that the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions are correct, and hereby **accepts** them as those of the court. Defendant's objections are **overruled**. Accordingly, the court **vacates and remands** the Commissioner's final decision for further proceedings consistent with the magistrate judge's Report and this order and opinion.

It is so ordered this 31st day of October, 2006.


Sam A. Lindsay
United States District Judge

*Defendant objections to the Report are essentially the same arguments it made before the magistrate judge. The court **overrules** these objections for the same reasons the magistrate judge rejected them. *See generally* Report at 9.